



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,443	12/03/2001	Yasumasa Mizushima	6640/66050	5171

7590 02/04/2005

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP  
1185 Avenues of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

SUAZO, RAINIER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

10/008,443

Applicant(s)

MIZUSHIMA ET AL.

Examiner,

Rainier Suazo

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/20/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-25** are presented pending in this application.

#### *Objections*

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims **1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Owens et al. (**US 6,633,630**), hereinafter "Owens".
4. Regarding claim 1,

Owens taught an information processing apparatus for processing a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected via a network, the apparatus comprising: a message reception part that receives a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**); a rule accumulation part that accumulates a plurality of rules for executing message processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 24-28**); a message conversion part that executes message conversion

Art Unit: 2144

processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated in the rule accumulation part (**abstract, figs. 1-2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); and a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**).

5. Regarding claim 8,

Owens taught an information processing method for processing a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected via a network, the method comprising the steps of receiving a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**); accumulating a plurality of rules for executing pieces of message processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 24-28**); executing message conversion processing according to accumulated by the accumulating step (**abstract, figs. 1 and 2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); the plurality of rules and executing a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**).

6. Regarding claim 15,

Owens taught a network system comprising: a message reception part that receives a message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**) to execute a prescribed piece of reception a rule accumulation part that accumulates rules for executing pieces of message processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 24-28**); a message conversion part that executes message conversion processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated in the rule

Art Unit: 2144

accumulation part (**abstract, figs. 1-2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); and a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**).

7. Regarding claims **2, 9 and 16**,

Owens taught a system further a part that starts a corresponding application on the prescribed server to execute message conversion processing when no suitable rules exist in the rule accumulation part (**column 10 lines 62-64**).

8. Regarding claims **3, 10 and 17**,

Owens taught a system wherein the message conversion part converts the message into a prescribed format according to a transmission origin of the message and contents of the message (**column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 3, column 11 lines 51-61**).

9. Regarding claims **4, 11 and 18**,

Owens taught a system, wherein the message conversion part specifies a transmission destination of the message according to a transmission origin of the message and contents of the message (**column 11 lines 56-61**).

10. Regarding claims **5, 12 and 19**,

Owens taught a system wherein the message conversion part performs automatic protocol conversion according to a message transmission destination specified according to a transmission origin of the message and contents of the message (**fig. 9, column 2 lines 52-57, column 10 lines 52-56 and column 13 lines 63-65**).

Art Unit: 2144

**11. Regarding claim 7, 14 and 21,**

Owens taught a method/apparatus/network system comprising: a message broker that commits to an application processing of data (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**) that becomes necessary when message conversion is performed among the plurality of sites (**abstract, figs. 1 and 2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); a message translator that performs mutual conversion between message formats according to a prescribed conditional sentence in response to an arrival of a field serving as a trigger in a message format (**abstract, figs. 1 and 2, column 7 lines 30-31, column 10 lines 49-52, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 3, column 11 lines 51-61**) .; message router that adds a destination address to the message according to a prescribed piece of identification information contained in the message (**column 11 lines 56-61, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**); a B2B connector that provides a message exchange interface between a system and a site outside the system (**column 10 lines 24-61 and figs. 1,6 and 7-9**); and a gateway that provides a local message exchange interface between the system and a local site inside the system (**column 13 line 46 to column 14 line 15 and figs. 1 and 12**).

**12. Regarding claims 22-25,**

Owens taught a system comprising parts for: receiving a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing (**column 7 lines 12-41**); accumulating a plurality of rules for executing the message processing (**column 7 lines 41-50 and column 8 lines 11-42**); executing message conversion processing according to a corresponding one of the plurality of rules accumulated by the rule

Art Unit: 2144

accumulation step (**column 8 lines 27-42**); and executing a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message (**column 8 lines 36-42**).

Owens disclosure is related to networked environments with servers and computers (see **figure 4**), such equipment was well known in the art; and inherently used computer software, recording medium, computer program, computer executable readable medium and apparatuses (see for example **column 20 line 7**).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**13.** Claims **6, 13 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens et al. (**US 6,633,630**), hereinafter "Owens" in view of Matsuo (**US 5,634,005**) hereinafter "Matsuo".

**14.** Regarding claims **6, 13 and 20**,

Owens taught a system substantially as claimed, however Owens did not expressly teach that the message conversion part executes encryption processing that corresponds to a message to a transmission destination that is specified according transmission origin of the message and contents of the message.

Art Unit: 2144

Matsuo, in the same field of invention related to facilitate and automate transmission of electronic mail messages, taught conditionally using encryption for automatic messages processing using rules (**figs. 6-9 and column 9 lines 8-25**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the methods/systems of Owens with the teachings of Matsuo. Owens motivated the exploration of the art of electronic mail communication (**abstract, figs. 1-3 and column 7 lines 37-41**) and the use of rules to process messages (**column 8 lines 36-42**). The art exploration motivate by Owens is, at least in part, the subject matter of Matsuo (**see title, abstract field of invention and column 1 line 40 to column 2 line 15**). The modification would improve Owens system by providing a system that receives a message and determine actions to be performed with the message and the message further transmission including using encryption procedures to send encrypted messages (**Matsuo, column 4 lines 50-57**) or decrypt a received encrypted message, therefore providing a more secure systems to protect end-users sensitive data.



Art Unit: 2144

***Conclusion***

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached PTO-892 for details.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rainier Suazo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rainier Suazo, MBA  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2144

  
WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800